



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/856,515	06/15/2001	Hwee Hwa Pang	P21103	5642

7055 7590 12/06/2004

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE  
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER

LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/856,515

Applicant(s)

PANG ET AL.

Examiner

Kenny Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date see detail action.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-32 are presented for examination.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The IDS submitted on October 9, 2001, April 12, 2002 and March 25, 2002 have been considered. However, certain documents are mission.

The information disclosure statement filed October 9, 2001 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. A copy of document "PKZIP (R) FAST! Create/Update Utility Version 2.04g, 1993-01-02" is needed in order for the information to be considered by the examiner.

The information disclosure statement filed April 12, 2002 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. A copy of document "Microsoft Office 97, 1997; Power Point 97, Pack&Go, Save as HTML; Outlook 97; Scheduler" is needed in order for the information to be considered by the examiner.

Both information disclosure statements have been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2154

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tahara et al (Tahara), US 6,134,580.

5. As per claim 1, Tahara taught the invention as claimed including a method for migrating a computing process from a first host to a second host (col. 14, lines 34-61), wherein said process discards data, and/or program code and/or execution states specific to the first host (col. 8, lines 41-67, col. 9, lines 1-9, col. 14, lines 58-61), and wherein said process receives data (col. 10, lines 10-14), and/or program code (col. 10, lines 53-60) and/or execution states (col. 9, lines 12-25) specific to said second host (col. 8, lines 41-67, col. 9, lines 1-9, col. 14, lines 34-61).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Art Unit: 2154

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2, 11 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tahara et al (Tahara), US 6,134,580, in view of "Official Notice".

8. As per claims 2, 11 and 21, Tahara taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Tahara further taught said process discards data, and/or program code and/or execution states specific to said first host after migration to said second host (col.8, lines 41-67, col.9, lines 1-9, col.14, lines 58-61). Tahara did not specifically teach said process discards data, and/or program code and/or execution states specific to said first host prior to migration to said second host; or before or after receiving data, and/or program code and/or execution states specific to said second data after the migration. However, Tahara taught that the data, program code and execution states are used to generate plan for the migration (col.11, lines 48-67, col.12, lines 1-47, col.14, lines 29-61) and that the data, program code and execution states of the first host are not needed in the migration since the migration only involves the generated plan (col.14, lines 29-61). Hence, it is obvious to discard data, program code and executions states specific to the first host at any desire point only the plan is generated. Official Notice is taken that the limitations narrowed by these claims are consider obvious and furthermore a matter of design choice. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

Art Unit: 2154

was made to combine the teachings of Tahara and “Official Notice” and discard the information stored in the first host at any user desire period of time prior or after the migration of the process.

9. Claims 3-4, 6-10, 12-17, 22-28 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tahara and Official Notice as applied to claims 2, 11 and 21 above, and further in view of Jagannathan et al (Jagannathan), US 6,496,871.

10. As per claims 3 and 12 and 22, Tahara taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 2, 11 and 21. Tahara further taught to form plans for migration (col.8, lines 58-67, col.11, lines 48-67, col.12, lines 1-47, col.13, lines 48-67, col.14, lines 1-4). Tahara did not specifically teach that prior to migration a construct is formed comprising application specific data, and/or program code and/or execution states of said process. Jagannathan taught to form a construct that comprises application specific data, and/or program code and/or execution states of said process prior to the migration (col.13, lines 23-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tahara and Jagannathan because Jagannathan’s teaching of forming a construct for migration enables Tahara’s method to perform whole or partial migration of objects.

11. As per claims 4, 13 and 23, Tahara and Jagannathan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 3, 12 and 22. Jagannathan further taught that the construct is formed by a construction operation and records application specific data, and/or program code and/or execution states of the construct (col.6, lines 11-30, col.13, lines 20-50). Tahara and

Art Unit: 2154

Jagannathan did not specifically teach to suspend all active threads of said process. La Porta taught to stop the processes in responding to migration request (col.9, lines 1-3, 35-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tahara, Jagannathan and La Porta because La Porta's teaching of stopping process at any time in response to a migration call enables Tahara and Jagannathan's method to quickly respond to migration (see La Porta col.9, lines 1-3).

12. As per claims 6, 14 and 24, Tahara and Jagannathan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 3, 12 and 22. Tahara and Jagannathan did not specifically teach that said construct is provided with an authorizing signature. However, it is obvious to provide authorizing signature to ensure only the receiving host is able to access the construct. Official Notice is taken that both the concept and advantage of using authorizing signature to ensure authorized use of the information is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tahara and Jagannathan and further encrypt the construct with authorizing signature to ensure only the receiving host of Tahara and Jagannathan's method is able to access the construct and prevent unauthorized access.

13. As per claims 7, 15 and 25, Tahara and Jagannathan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 3, 12 and 22. Jagannathan further taught that said construct is sent directly to said second host on a communication medium (col.17, lines 50-67, col.18, lines 1-23).

Art Unit: 2154

14. As per claims 8, 16 and 26, Tahara and Jagannathan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 3, 12 and 22. Jagannathan taught that certain objects can be sent to an intermediary host and subsequently to the second host (col.11, lines 41-48). Tahara and Jagannathan did not specifically teach said construct is sent to an intermediary memory storage means, and subsequently to said second host. However, it would have been obvious to place the construct in the temporary storage prior to the period of migration. Official Notice is taken that both the concept and advantage of storing information in an intermediary memory storage as a temporary storage is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tahara, Jagannathan and further enable the construct or other objects to be first stored in a temporary storage during the process of migration in order to protect the objects from corruption in migration.

15. As per claims 9, 17 and 27, Tahara and Jagannathan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 7, 15 and 25. Jagannathan further taught that a second process is created/run on said second host that comprises the data, program code and execution statues in said construct (col.17, lines 50-67, col.18, lines 1-23, 39-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tahara and Jagannathan because Jagannathan's teaching of whole migration enables Tahara's method to move processes of different hosts to another host and perform further process at the another host.



Art Unit: 2154

16. As per claims 10 and 28, Tahara and Jagannathan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 9 and 27. Jagannathan further taught that in said second host a third process is created containing system specific data, and/or program code and/or execution states relating to said second host (col.9, lines 15-41) and wherein said second process assimilates said third process (col.9, lines 15-41; simultaneously).

17. As per claims 31, Tahara taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Tahara did not specifically teach that the data, and/or program code and/or execution states discarded by said process relates to library modules and/or input/output device drivers of said first host. Jagannathan taught that data, and/or program code and/or execution states relates to library modules and/or input/output device drivers of said first host are marked not to be migrated (col.11, lines 34-41, e.g. discard). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tahara and Jagannathan because Jagannathan's teaching of discarding the object in relate to device drivers of the host ensures that important objects of certain hosts of Tahara's method are not migrated to the other host.

18. As per claim 32, Tahara taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Tahara further taught that the data, and/or program code and/or execution states received by said process relates to input/output device drivers of said second host (col.8, lines 8-13, col.10, lines 55-58). Tahara did not specifically teach that the data received by the process relates to library module of the second host. However, it is obvious to provide information such as data, program code or execution states from at library module such as information storage. Jagannathan taught that

Art Unit: 2154

data, and/or program code and/or execution states received may be provided from library modules and/or input/output device drivers of said second host (col.11, lines 34-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tahara and Jagannathan because Jagannathan's teaching of using storage modules in providing information enables Tahara's method to perform process using objects that are statically dependent to the host.

19. Claims 5, 18-20 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tahara, Official Notice and Jagannathan as applied to claims 4, 17 and 28 above, and further in view of La Porta et al (La Porta), US 6,085,086.

20. As per claim 5, Tahara, Jagannathan and La Porta taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4. Tahara taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4. Jagannathan further taught said construct comprises only data, program code and execution states falling within lists that are passed to said construct operation (col.11, lines 34-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tahara, Jagannathan and La Porta because Jagannathan's teaching of migrating only the object that are listed as information that can be migrated enables Tahara, Jagannathan and La Porta's method to keep the objects that should not be moved.

21. As per claims 18 and 29, Tahara and Jagannathan taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 17 and 28. Jagannathan further taught said second process performs a mutate

Art Unit: 2154

operation and discards system specific data and/or program code and/or execution states relating to said first host (col.6, lines 11-30, col.12, lines 6-11, col.13, lines 20-50). Tahara and Jagannathan did not specifically teach to suspend all active threads of said second process. La Porta taught to stop the processes in responding to migration request (col.9, lines 1-3, 35-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tahara, Jagannathan and La Porta because La Porta's teaching of stopping process at any time in response to a migration call enables Tahara and Jagannathan's method to quickly respond to migration (see La Porta col.9, lines 1-3).

22. As per claims 19 and 30, Tahara, Jagannathan and La Porta taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 18 and 29. Jagannathan further taught said second process comprises only data, program code and execution states falling within lists that are passed to said mutate operation (col.11, lines 34-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Tahara and Jagannathan because Jagannathan's teaching of migrating only the object that are listed as information that can be migrated enables Tahara and Jagannathan's method to keep the objects that should not be moved.

23. As per claim 20, Tahara, Jagannathan and La Porta taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 19. Jagannathan further taught that in said second host a third process is created containing system specific data, and/or program code and/or execution states relating to

Art Unit: 2154

said second host (col.9, lines 15-41) and wherein said second process assimilates said third process (col.9, lines 15-41; simultaneously).

*Conclusion*

24. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tue.-Fri. and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ksl  
December 1, 2004

*Wen-Jia L*  
12/1/04